

Remarks/Arguments

This invention relates to isochronous signals, as the term is well known in the art. The term "isochronous" is well known to mean a time characteristic of an event or signal recurring at known periodic intervals. See page 686 of the *IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronic Terms*, 5th Edition, 1993, copy enclosed. The Applicants want to call the Examiner's attention to the fact that the IEEE definition of "isochronous" is fully consistent with the definition set forth in the instant specification, that isochronous means that data to be transmitted arise regularly at the data source, the data also arising with approximately the same size each time.

The Examiner has relied upon WO 95/15651 to Bunting et al. Bunting et al does not relate to isochronous signals. Rather, Bunting specifically relates to variable length code word data. See page 3, lines 22 and 33, and page 4, lines 1, 3, 5, 19 and 31, for example. As a result, Bunting requires the use of a signal delay network in unit 14. See page 4, line 12. It is therefore clear that Bunting et al. does not show isochronous signals as well known in the art. Since Claim 1 specifically recites the assembly of data packets for isochronous data transmission, a data format for the isochronous data transmission being defined in an isochronous data format header of a pulse packet, it is clear that the patentability of Claim 1 is not affected by the reference to Bunting et al.

The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 2 and 3.

Claims 4 and 5 are dependent from Claim 1 and set forth further advantageous features. These subclaims are submitted to be patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claim 6 similarly recites an isochronous data format header for a data packet of the isochronous data transmission. Nowhere does Bunting et al. teach or suggest isochronous data, as well known in the art. In fact, Bunting et al. teaches a signal delay network in unit 14 in order to properly time the data. It is therefore clear that Bunting et al. does not affect the patentability of Claim 6.

Claim 7 is dependent from Claim 6 and recites a further advantageous feature. The Applicants submit that Claim 7 is patentable as its parent Claim 6.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 09/937,468
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2005

PATENT
PD990017

The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claim 8.

Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claims 10 and 11. As discussed above, nowhere does the reference to Bunting et al. teach or suggest either isochronous data packets nor an isochronous data bus. The Applicants therefore submit that the patentability of Claim 9, as amended, is not affected by the reference to Bunting et al.

Since the subject matter of Claims 10 and 11 has been incorporated into Claim 9, Claims 10 and 11 have been cancelled.

Claim 12 is dependent from Claim 9 and adds a further advantageous feature. The Applicants submit that Claim 12 is patentable as its parent Claim 9.

The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 13 and 14.

Claims 15-17 are dependent upon Claim 9 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent claim.

Claim 18 has been amended to include the features of Claims 21 and 22. As discussed above, nowhere does the reference to Bunting et al. teach or suggest either isochronous data packets or an isochronous data bus. The Applicants therefore submit that the patentability of Claim 18 as amended is not affected by the reference to Bunting et al.

Claim 19 is dependent from Claim 18 and adds a further advantageous feature. The Applicants submit that Claim 19 is patentable as its parent Claim 18.

The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claim 20.

Since the subject matter of Claims 21 and 22 has been included in Claim 18, Claims 21 and 22 have been cancelled.

Claim 23 is dependent from Claim 18 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that Claim 23 is patentable as its parent Claim 18.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 09/937,468
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2005

PATENT
PD990017

Claim 24 specifically recites isochronous data transmission and an isochronous data format header. As discussed above, nowhere does the reference to Bunting et al. teach or suggest this method. It is therefore clear that the reference to Bunting et al. does not affect the patentability of Claim 24.

The Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of Claims 25 and 27.

In order to expedite the allowance of this application, Claim 26 has been cancelled.

U.S. Patent 5,991,842 to Takayama also fails to teach or suggest isochronous data transmission nor an isochronous data bus. It is therefore clear that the patentability of the instant claims is not affected by the reference to Takayama.

U.S. Patent 6,259,694 to Sato et al. similarly fails to teach or suggest isochronous data transmission nor an isochronous data bus. It is therefore clear that Sato et al. does not affect the patentability of the instant claims.

The Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
TIMOTHY HEIGHWAY ET AL.

By Catherine A. Ferguson
Catherine A. Ferguson, Attorney
Registration No. 40,877
(609) 734-6440

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

Date: February 3, 2006